

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA  
MACON DIVISION**

**LARRY JEROME KEITH,**

**Plaintiff,**

**vs.**

**LESTER PEEK,**

**Defendant.**

:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:

**Civil Action No.:**  
**5:04-cv-143 (CAR)**

---

***ORDER ON THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION  
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE***

Before the Court is the United States Magistrate Judge’s Recommendation (doc. 107) that Defendant Lester Peek’s Motion for Summary Judgment (doc. 88) be granted. Plaintiff Larry Jerome Keith filed an Objection to the Recommendation (doc. 109). Having considered the briefs of the parties, the United States Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation, and Plaintiff’s Objection (doc. 109) thereto, the Court agrees with the Recommendation.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, the Recommendation that Defendant Lester Peek’s Motion for Summary Judgment (doc. 88) be **GRANTED** is hereby **ADOPTED** and **MADE THE ORDER OF THE COURT**. In light of the Court’s foregoing determination, Plaintiff’s Motion to Appoint Counsel (doc. 114) filed subsequent to the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation is **DENIED AS MOOT**.

**SO ORDERED**, this 12<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2007.

S/ C. Ashley Royal  
C. ASHLEY ROYAL  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

JAB/ehe

---

<sup>1</sup> In his Objection, Plaintiff merely restates the main argument—that Defendant Peek “were [sic] aware of my complaints and liable for the actions of the contracted medical svcs”—he offered in his Response (doc. 102) to Defendant Peek’s Motion for Summary Judgment (doc. 88). In the Court’s view, Plaintiff’s failure to offer any law or other facts in support of his renewed contention does not merit further inquiry or analysis.